United Nations E/CN.17/2011/13

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
18 February 2011

Original: English

Commission on Sustainable Development
Nineteenth session
2-13 May 2011
Item 3 of the provisional agenda*
Thematic cluster for the implementation cycle 2010-2011 — policy session

Report of the high-level intersessional meeting of the Commission on Sustainable Development on a 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production patterns

(Panama City, 13 and 14 January 2011)

* E/CN.17/2011/1.

11-23892 (E) 110311

Please recycle

Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	3
II.	Sessions and round tables	5
III.	Chair's summary of plenary sessions and round tables	7

I. Introduction

1. At the request of Member States during its eighteenth session and as a contribution to the intersessional consultative process for the nineteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development, the Department of Economic and Social Affairs and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) held a high-level intersessional meeting of the Commission on a 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production patterns, hosted by the Government of Panama. The meeting took place in Panama City on 13 and 14 January 2011.

2. The meeting was attended by 155 participants, representing States in Africa (10), Asia (18), Eastern Europe (11), Latin America and the Caribbean (26) and Western European and other States (27) including Australia, Canada and the United States of America. The Holy See was present as observer and the European Union was also represented. The United Nations system was represented by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), UNEP, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). There were also a number of representatives from major groups. In addition to its National Environmental Authority, the host country of Panama was represented by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Social Development, the National Secretariat for Science, Technology and Innovation, the National Association for the Preservation of Nature, the Panama Maritime Authority, the Panama Canal Authority and the Authority for Protection of Consumers and Safeguarding Competition.

3. The discussions were based on two background documents, the first containing a review of options for the institutional structure for the 10-year framework of programmes and the second containing criteria and guidelines for potential programmes together with an annex compiling programmes submitted as a result of a call for proposals. Both documents can be found on the website for the nineteenth session of the Commission, available at www.un.org/esa/dsd/dsd_aofw_scpp/scpp_tenyearframprog.shtml.

4. The concept of sustainable consumption and production is contained in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, adopted in 2002 at the World Summit on Sustainable Development. Sustainable consumption and production forms one of the three overarching objectives of, and essential requirements for, sustainable development, together with poverty eradication and the management of natural resources in order to foster economic and social development.

5. Strong political commitment has been demonstrated for sustainable consumption and production since the World Summit, including through regional round tables on sustainable consumption and production, the endorsement of regional strategies on such concepts in Africa, Latin America, Europe and the Arab region, the development of national sustainable consumption and production programmes and increased efforts to mainstream the concept into development plans.

6. The high level of political commitment to promoting sustainable consumption and production is reflected most recently in the updated and revised Strategic Plan

for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, which include a sustainable consumption and production target (Aichi Biodiversity Target 4): "By 2020, at the latest, Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits".[1]

7. During discussions on a 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production patterns held at the eighteenth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development, success stories with regard to sustainable consumption and production were presented, but it was noted that initiatives were often fragmented and missed opportunities to realize synergies. Delegations noted that a 10-year framework of programmes was needed to provide strengthened and coherent international support for the diversity of existing policy and other initiatives at the national and regional levels and to help Member States and other stakeholders address new and emerging sustainable consumption and production challenges. Initiatives to date, such as the Marrakech Process,[2] have been voluntary in nature, and while they have been effective as an interim means of bringing together communities of interest and sharing knowledge and information across countries and regions, they lack a formal mechanism that would ensure sustainability.

8. The Commission recognized that the framework could provide a platform for the broad sharing of experience, lessons learned, best practices and knowledge at multiple levels and could allow for the replication and scaling up of successful initiatives. It could also assist countries in monitoring progress towards their own goals and objectives. It was noted by many delegates that the framework should help to mobilize the technical and financial support necessary to promote the implementation of national and regional initiatives.

9. The intersessional meeting will be important for the success of the Intergovernmental Preparatory Meeting, to be held between 28 February and 4 March 2011, and to the negotiations on a 10-year framework during the nineteenth session of the Commission, to be held from 2 to 13 May 2011.

---

[1] The updated and revised Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets were adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its tenth meeting, held from 18 to 29 October 2010, in Nagoya, Japan. The Aichi Biodiversity Targets include 20 headline targets, organized under five strategic goals. One of these goals addresses the underlying causes of biodiversity loss and includes Target 4 (see UNEP/CBD/COP/10/27, annex, decision X/2).

[2] Launched in 2003, in response to chapter III of the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg Plan of Implementation), the Marrakech Process is a global and informal multi-stakeholder platform to promote the implementation of policies and capacity-building on sustainable consumption and production and to support the development of a 10-year framework of programmes. The United Nations Environment Programme and the Department of Economic and Social Affairs are the facilitating bodies for this process, with the active participation of national Governments, development agencies, the private sector, civil society and other stakeholders.

II. Sessions and round tables

10. The meeting was opened by the Administrator General of the National Environmental Authority of Panama, Lucía Chandeck, and the Minister of Environment and Forestry of Romania and Chair of the nineteenth session of the Commission on Social Development, László Borbély. Ms. Chandeck, after welcoming everyone to Panama, underlined the importance of sustainable consumption and production for sustainable development. She also stressed the importance of the intersessional meeting for the preparation of the nineteenth session of the Commission.

11. Mr. Borbély underlined that progress on the important topic of sustainable consumption and production could only be achieved by a strong partnership among Governments and private and public entities, with the strong involvement of civil society. He also stressed the importance of the meeting in helping to develop a supportive international framework to promote more sustainable consumption and production patterns, which could also contribute towards the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development in 2012.

12. The opening was followed by a presentation on the objectives of the intersessional meeting and a road map to the nineteenth session of the Commission by the Director of the Division for Sustainable Development of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs. He underlined in particular the challenge facing the Commission, at its nineteenth session, to de-compartmentalize the sustainable consumption and production agenda and to mainstream the concept across Government agencies and regional and international entities.

13. The Director of the Division of Technology, Industry and Economics of UNEP spoke about the accomplishments and lessons of the Marrakech Process and their relevance to the development of a 10-year framework of programmes for negotiation at the nineteenth session.

14. This was followed by a statement from the Chair of the Commission, who presented his views about the elements he believed should be taken into consideration when designing a framework. The vision for the framework needed to be shared by all stakeholders and reflect their level of ambition and aspiration in pursuing and implementing sustainable consumption and production. There was a need for a common understanding of the main functions of the framework and the institutional structure that could best fulfil those functions, allowing for the gathering and sharing of experience and progress, as well as knowledge on sustainable consumption and production. In doing so, common objectives and targets needed to be identified by using existing sustainable consumption and production forums and initiatives, linking and building synergies among them through an effective and efficient institutional architecture.

15. The opening session concluded with the plenary discussion on goals and objectives of the framework. It was followed by the first session, chaired by representatives from Germany and Mexico, during which the main objectives and functions for the possible framework were discussed, as were key elements of the framework. To facilitate the discussions in the subsequent round tables, an officer of the Division for Sustainable Development gave a presentation on mapping potential functions of the framework. Following discussions in four round tables, rapporteurs presented the views expressed at the round tables to the plenary.

16. The second session, chaired by representatives of Guatemala and the United States, focused on the potential structure of the framework, discussing its key elements and mechanisms. It followed the same format as the first session. Round tables were preceded by the presentation of lessons learned from the comparison of models for the framework by the Chief of the Policy Analysis and Networks Branch of the Division for Sustainable Development and the Deputy Director of the Division of Technology, Industry and Economics of UNEP. Following the round-table discussions, rapporteurs presented views expressed in the four round tables to the plenary.

17. The first day was concluded by a statement by the Under-Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs and Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, delivered by the Director of the Division for Sustainable Development. The statement focused on sustainable consumption and production and the path to the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development to be held in 2012 (Rio+20). In the statement, the Under-Secretary-General underlined that the objective of the Conference would be to ensure renewed political commitment for sustainable development, assess progress to date and remaining gaps in implementation and address new and emerging challenges, while the thematic focus areas would be on a green economy in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication and an institutional framework for sustainable development. Sustainable consumption and production patterns were intrinsically linked to these objectives and themes. It was also stressed that sustainable consumption and production cut across all economic sectors. The agenda would be for all Government agencies, not just for environmental ministries. The 10-year framework, if adopted and translated into specific initiatives and actions, could become an important engine to support the implementation of the outcomes of the Conference. It could promote rapid progress towards decent living standards for all human beings and at the same time help to achieve significant reductions in the environmental impact of consumption and production. It would be an important building block for an ambitious international agreement at the Conference.

18. The third session was chaired by representatives of Italy and Mali. The discussion centred on key programme areas and criteria for building programmes for a framework. Prior to the round-table discussions, the Chief of the Sustainable Consumption and Production Branch of the Division of Technology, Industry and Economics of UNEP made a presentation on potential guidelines and criteria to select and build programmes based on regional priorities and programmes submitted by various stakeholders and Member States in response to the call for programmes issued by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Following the round-table discussions, rapporteurs presented views expressed in the four round tables to the plenary.

19. The fourth session was chaired by representatives of the Czech Republic and Indonesia. The discussion centred on support and means of implementation at the national and regional levels. Agencies and programmes of the United Nations were invited to describe how they were contributing to sustainable consumption and production and how the framework could help them better deliver on that goal. The presentations were followed by discussions among Member States.

20. The concluding session was chaired by the Vice-Chair of the nineteenth session of the Commission, Andrew Goledzinowski (Australia). In concluding

remarks, Ms. Chandeck presented elements of the summary by the Chair of the Commission, which was distributed in its draft form to all participants. In that summary, the Chair talked about the way forward, especially stressing the need to work towards achieving a 10-year framework that represented the highest common denominator. The Chair stressed that there appeared to be an emerging convergence on the functions of a 10-year framework, its coordinated institutional structure and the criteria for developing programmes, and concluded by expressing his assurance that the nineteenth session would be able to achieve progress on sustainable consumption and production.

III. Summary by the Chair of the Commission of plenary sessions and round tables

21. The following is a summary of the key proposals, ideas and concerns raised in the discussions, both in plenary and round tables. The summary follows the order described above, highlighting areas of broad convergence, areas where many or several Member States and other stakeholders would appear to agree and areas where there is no apparent convergence of views and more dialogue is needed.

Opening session
Setting the context

22. There was general agreement among the participants that a 10-year framework of programmes was needed and that it should be concluded at the nineteenth session of the Commission. Speakers noted that the recent multiple crises had served as a stark reminder of the urgency of changing consumption and production patterns from their current pattern. Many stressed the need for political will to be ambitious and actionable in launching a framework that, a decade from now, could honestly be assessed as having contributed in a meaningful way to achieving sustainable patterns of consumption and production in all countries.

23. The sustainable consumption and production agenda was embedded in the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development and the Rio Principles contained in the Declaration, including the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities. It was a cross-cutting issue and had been addressed as such in sessions of the Commission, starting at the eleventh session, after the World Summit on Sustainable Development of 2002, which had given the mandate to develop a 10-year framework of programmes on sustainable consumption and production patterns.

24. It was stressed that it was of high importance that the framework should be able to address the three dimensions of sustainable development in a balanced and integrated manner and be supported by a globally recognized, credible and coherent science base. The importance of building the framework from the ground up was stressed, as was the need to ensure that it had the flexibility to meet diverse needs and priorities of different countries (developed, developing and with economies in transition), as well as the ability to ensure that future programmes could be easily incorporated within the framework. In that regard, there was broad recognition by speakers of the need to build on the accomplishments of the Marrakech Process, which was cited as a good example of incorporating regional and national needs and

identifying gaps in implementation. It was further mentioned that the framework could be built upon existing institutional arrangements.

25. It was suggested that it was time to shift from merely advocating sustainable consumption and production to actually setting up an effective framework to support the mainstreaming of the concept across all areas of decision-making, both public and private.

Goal and objectives of the framework

26. There was a broad convergence of views that the framework should have ambitious goals. Several countries stressed the need to shape and launch at the nineteenth session an ambitious and actionable 10-year framework of programmes in support of regional and national initiatives to accelerate the shift towards sustainable consumption and production to promote social and economic development within the carrying capacity of ecosystems.

27. Participants stressed the importance of a common global vision and shared goals as a basis for the framework, but views differed on the nature of the vision. While some participants were of the view that the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation provided a vision and goals, and these could simply be reaffirmed rather than spending time negotiating a new vision, others felt that the goals of the framework should be more actionable than those contained in the Johannesburg Plan.

28. Many agreed that aspirational goals were important, but there was less agreement on whether specific, quantified goals would be useful, considering the wide diversity among countries' levels of development and priorities. Several countries suggested the adaptation of overall goals into region-specific goals. A number supported a differentiated approach to defining goals and objectives, based on experience and capacities in different countries, which resembled an approach from the ground up.

29. It was suggested that the framework could place primary emphasis on seizing win-win opportunities, such as energy efficiency improvements, with multiple economic, social and/or environmental benefits.

30. Some participants insisted that participation in the framework should be seen as voluntary.

31. A few participants suggested that the framework should represent only the initial step of a long process, which might entail future ambitious agreements, such as a legally binding framework.

Session 1
Functions of a framework

32. There was broad acceptance of the functions enumerated in the first background paper, namely: (a) commitment to global common goals and vision; (b) knowledge sharing and networking; (c) enabling frameworks and strategic planning and investment; (d) technical cooperation; (e) collaboration; and (f) awareness-raising, education and civil society mobilization.

33. Emphasis was placed by many participants on the importance of the involvement of all key stakeholders at all stages and of mainstreaming sustainable

consumption and production in all ministries and policymaking processes. Among the most frequent suggestions for additional functions of the framework were: financial cooperation and capacity-building, to complement technical cooperation, and support for innovation.

34. It was reiterated that the framework should serve an important clearing house function. Building public-private partnerships was seen to be particularly important as a means of engaging business in the framework. Some noted the importance of scaling up investment in infrastructure to support sustainable consumption and production patterns not only through private sector engagement but also through involvement of international financial institutions.

35. A number of participants stressed the importance of engaging the educational system and the scientific community in sustainable consumption and production by building a strong science base for policy and providing young people with the knowledge and skills to become adults literate in sustainable consumption and production. The need to support the participation of scientists from developing countries in such research networks was also stressed.

36. Several participants mentioned the role of the media in awareness-raising and influencing public opinion, which in turn could have an impact on policymaking and on the strength of political commitment to promote and implement sustainable consumption and production. Information and communication technologies were important enabling technologies, and it was highlighted that an important function of the framework was to ensure effective communication of what sustainable consumption and production was about and why it was important to all countries.

37. More discussion was needed with respect to indicators and monitoring progress, on the subject of which various views were expressed. It was suggested that, if such monitoring was included as a function of the framework, it should apply not only to regional and national actions but to international support as well. It should also be adapted to the level of development. It was observed that national mechanisms for monitoring and review would need strengthening in many developing countries.

38. A number of participants flagged the need for sensitivity as to how the framework and its functions would relate to other processes and international negotiations, for example those of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development to be held in 2012 (Rio+20), of the World Trade Organization and of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, in order to avoid duplication and conflicts but also to find possible synergies where feasible.

39. Several countries also flagged the special challenges and priorities of the least developed countries and the small island developing States with respect to the implementation of sustainable consumption and production. The framework needed to address the fact that, for the poor in developing countries, the problem remained one of underconsumption. In this regard, one participant referred to an emphasis on sufficiency over efficiency in consumption.

Session 2
Institutional structure

40. There was a rich discussion of possible lessons and elements which might be drawn from the six models reviewed in the first background paper (the Marrakech

Process, the Millennium Development Goals, the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, the Global Alliance for Vaccine and Immunization (GAVI Alliance) and such inter-agency coordination mechanisms as UN-Water, UN-Energy and UN-Oceans), as well as some others that were not reviewed (e.g., "One United Nations" projects in eight pilot countries). There was a broad convergence that the six models provided a good basis on which to start discussions; however a few participants indicated that they found it difficult to draw lessons because some models were designed to serve very different functions.

Usefulness of models

41. Several countries supported a framework structure similar to the model of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management with its three key features of a political declaration, global policy and programmes. It was also noted approvingly by those countries that the Strategic Approach engaged all stakeholders on an equal footing.

42. It was mentioned that, in evaluating how well a model delivered, it was important to evaluate its cost-effectiveness. By one assessment, for example, the Strategic Approach was heavy on administration and relatively costly. Some participants suggested that a scaled-down version of the Strategic Approach could be more effective.

43. Some countries mentioned the positive lessons from the Marrakech Process, arguing that the model based on the Millennium Development Goals seemed too broad, the model based on the GAVI Alliance too specific, and the model followed by UN-Water, UN-Energy and UN-Oceans perhaps suitable for inter-agency coordination but not appropriate for the facilitation of broader stakeholder engagement.

44. One participant observed that the level of ambition for the framework would influence the choice of model to emulate, as the Marrakech Process model was more voluntary than the other models reviewed. On the other hand, with informality came flexibility. Generally, there would seem to be a beginning of a convergence towards a scaled-down version of the Strategic Approach or a more formal version of the Marrakech Process.

Flexibility

45. A number of participants emphasized the need for flexibility of the framework, in order to ensure that programmes could be added as the need arose (e.g., the agriculture supply chain), emerging issues could be addressed and regional and national specificities accommodated. Reference was made in particular to ways of engaging different stakeholders and ensuring a balanced participation of the public and private sectors.

46. A few participants stressed that form followed function, suggesting that the key elements of the framework could not be determined before Member States had formally agreed on the functions to be served.

Mainstreaming at the national and regional levels

47. The importance of regional and national centres for sustainable consumption and production was underlined. The majority were of the view that focal points should be used as bridges between different levels and it was also underlined that they should involve not only Governments but also other relevant stakeholders. It was suggested by some that national and regional focal points could report regularly to an international secretariat charged with reviewing progress.

48. High-level political ownership of the sustainable consumption and production agenda was a challenge that needed to be addressed in many countries, but perhaps especially in developing countries faced with multiple other sustainable development challenges. The Strategic Approach and the Millennium Development Goals were both models that had secured high-level political commitment.

49. In most countries, the issue of sustainable consumption and production remained largely confined to the environment ministries, but a few examples existed of where there had been a broader mainstreaming of the issue, including in economics, finance and planning ministries. UNEP has supported several countries in such efforts and had developed guidelines for that purpose. This was an area where the sharing of experience could be facilitated by the framework.

50. One participant described a successful experience with subregional coordination across environment ministries in Central America. They had developed regional projects and dealt with donors and development banks in a coordinated fashion, which had facilitated fund-raising for the work programme.

51. It was noted that some challenges relating to sustainable consumption and production called for a global, cross-regional approach, as many supply chains were global in nature and taking a life cycle approach to sustainable consumption and production would necessarily involve multiple regions.

52. Several participants noted that an effective framework would require mainstreaming the sustainable consumption and production agenda into the work of most United Nations agencies, funds and programmes, as well as the agendas of the international financial institutions, taking into consideration their governing structures and arrangements, and mainstreaming the agenda into the work of bilateral development cooperation agencies.

Knowledge sharing

53. Different structures and arrangements could facilitate knowledge sharing at different levels. At the regional level, research centres and knowledge hubs could be valuable. Sharing at the national level could be done through national networks and cross-ministerial task forces or working groups. Several participants saw a need to share policy knowledge and experience within and across regions.

54. One participant cited the Marrakech Process experience, where knowledge sharing networks were set up at all levels as a voluntary process. Another suggested that the Strategic Approach model was well suited, with national focal points, including both Government officials and other stakeholders, connected in networks and with a more formalized structure, yielding stronger commitment to achieving goals.

structures, promoting inter-agency collaboration and involving major stakeholders. There was a strong preference for reliance on existing institutions for implementation of the framework, with greater coherence and coordination among them. For that reason, several States agreed that a lead, coordinating institution could be useful.

63. A number of participants supported the establishment of a dedicated secretariat for the framework. Some participants referred to one or two organizations. Others indicated that accountability would be enhanced if one agency had oversight of the process, and they supported the creation of a single secretariat, within an existing institution based on its proven comparative advantage, to serve a coordinating function. Nevertheless, they stressed the need to coordinate with all relevant United Nations agencies, any of which could lead programmes in their respective areas of expertise.

64. A few participants made a distinction between a coordination function and a secretariat function, and one observed that in the case of the Strategic Approach, its governing body set strategic direction and coordinated among members, while the secretariat worked to implement its decisions.

Session 3
Criteria and guidelines for programme selection

65. There was a broad agreement that the criteria in the second background paper for programme selection formed a good basis for discussion at the Intergovernmental Preparatory Meeting. It was emphasized that programmes should contribute to progress in integrating the three pillars of sustainable development. They should advance sustainable consumption and production patterns, including by promoting an efficient and sustainable use of resources within the carrying capacity of ecosystems. They should stimulate creativity and innovation. They should be flexible and adaptable to different national and regional needs, priorities and capacities.

Criteria

66. There was a suggestion that programmes could be thematic, covering broad areas. Such umbrella programmes could support multiple thematic initiatives at the national and regional levels. An example of a flexible and comprehensive approach was the work of the Marrakech Process on sustainable public procurement, with tools developed by the Marrakech Task Force and tested and adapted to both developed and developing countries.

67. Some suggested that programmes should be global in focus, while many emphasized that they should be applicable to developed and developing countries and have the flexibility to be adapted to different needs, priorities and capacities. To that end, criteria could exist for global programmes, which would support regional, national and local initiatives.

68. It was suggested that programmes should cover areas not yet addressed by international policies, promote synergies and avoid duplication. There was wide agreement that programmes should address gaps in existing initiatives, the case of agri-food supply chains being given as one example.

69. Multi-stakeholder participation in programmes, from concept development through implementation to monitoring, was important to confer ownership; some

felt that it should be a criterion. The importance of engaging business was stressed, including through corporate social responsibility and the promotion of entrepreneurship.

70. Many agreed that programmes should take a life cycle approach but that not every programme could or should address all stages of the life cycle. At least one participant indicated that programmes should use a mix of instruments to effect shifts in sustainable consumption and production patterns.

71. Other criteria suggested included: leveraging resources from different sources, ensuring transparency, avoiding green protectionism, providing incentives, being voluntary, having a strong scientific base, having a positive benefit-cost ratio and resulting in concrete changes to sustainable consumption and production patterns. The last would require indicators to assess consuming differently, less or better.

72. Several felt that the criteria should be based on previous experience of the reviewed models and of others that had not been reviewed, such as poverty reduction strategies, the "Delivering as one" pilot initiative and the African 10-year framework programme on sustainable consumption and production.

Components

73. Some indicated that it was important to distinguish, in the annex to the second background paper circulated for the meeting, between programmes (global structure) and local and regional initiatives, several of which could be supported by a single programme.

74. There was also some support for the idea that programmes needed an indicator and monitoring component, possibly using at least a minimum set of standard indicators. How that might work in practice would need to be more clearly defined. One participant warned that past efforts to agree on indicators had been progressing very slowly.

Areas

75. Several participants indicated that the Marrakech Process has already identified regional sustainable consumption and production priorities based on processes held in each region and these priorities had guided the submission of several programmes in the annex. Other initiatives and agencies had also developed capacity and lessons that could be scaled up.

76. One suggestion was to cluster programmes into production-oriented, product-oriented, consumption-oriented and cross-cutting, but preference was expressed that a life cycle perspective be maintained. Another suggestion was to focus on 5 to 10 broad (cross-cutting) programme areas, for which clear goals and targets would be defined.

77. As in the case of the Strategic Approach, it was noted that not all programmes needed to be agreed at the outset, as long as criteria were agreed upon. The framework needed to be flexible enough to accommodate new programmes. However, concrete programmes from the outset would more easily lead to funding. For instance, the European Union indicated that it was exploring extending the successful SWITCH Asia programme to Africa and Latin America, but this required concrete programmes where value for money was clear.

78. E-waste and integrated waste management, sustainable agriculture and food (including fertilizer) were identified as gap areas which could be the focus of programmes. It was emphasized that criteria were important to avoid having a laundry list of programmes. Some participants questioned whether issues discussed in other forums such as carbon and eco-labelling should be included in the framework.

79. In identifying programmes, the successes of the Marrakech Process and other international, regional and national initiatives should be built upon. A few participants suggested that without a national framework on sustainable consumption and production, little progress was possible. It was suggested that table 3 of the second background paper could serve as a map for countries to guide their thinking on a framework for sustainable consumption and production at the national level and to select voluntary programmes. Good programmes would most likely be selected and adapted from previous experience.

Session 4
International support and means of implementation for national and regional delivery

80. A successful framework would have three important elements: it would be comprehensive, it would be integrated and it would have the necessary resources.

81. Developing countries placed great importance on ensuring that resources were adequate for effective implementation of the framework, including for building effective national sustainable consumption and production programmes. Several stressed that new resource mobilization needed to be given proper attention.

82. Most developed countries emphasized the more efficient use, leveraging and realignment of existing resources to address new priorities such as sustainable consumption and production. It was mentioned that some donors were realigning priorities to provide greater support to sustainable consumption and production but that this must respond to national priorities, and national Governments must first own the agenda for sustainable consumption and production.

83. The contribution of the international financial institutions and regional development banks should be further considered.

84. Private sector resources, including finance, technology and expertise, also needed to be tapped, and it was critical to provide incentives for active private sector engagement in the implementation of sustainable consumption and production.

85. It was noted that, in designing programmes to support sustainable consumption and production, the assumption that developed countries were "clean" and developing countries "dirty" should be challenged, and thus the South will be handed over capabilities to be cleaner. Developed countries needed to take the lead in changing consumption and production patterns, but learning could go both ways. There was also considerable scope for South-South cooperation.

86. The work on sustainable consumption and production of the regional commissions of the United Nations and of a number of United Nations agencies was presented.

87. The regional commissions implemented sustainable development programmes of priority to their regions, enabling the sharing of experience. In the Latin American region, for example, these included programmes on low carbon transport, urban development, sustainable cities, small and medium enterprise development, scientific and technological development policy and fiscal policy, that could support implementation of the framework. The regional commissions were multidisciplinary in their staff and in the institutions they supported, extending beyond the environmental realm. For instance, a policy observatory was currently being developed that could support exchange of information and experience on sustainable consumption and production initiatives.

88. Working closely with national Governments, especially on capacity-building, UNDP was the lead United Nations agency in each country and was also relevant to the sustainable consumption and production process. UNDP had a large natural resource management portfolio focused on primary production, across landscapes covering agriculture, fisheries, forestry, tourism, protected areas, water, energy and adaptation to climate change. Increasingly it was also working with the private sector and market development. Key approaches of relevance to sustainable consumption and production were supply chain management, certification and carbon credits and economic valuation of ecosystem services. UNDP country offices could support national implementation of sustainable consumption and production, especially through programmes to support sustainable consumption.

89. UNEP had been active in the field of sustainable consumption and production since the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002, with its Governing Council endorsing its first decision on sustainable consumption and production in 2003. Since then, UNEP had supported the secretariat of the Marrakech Process, jointly with the Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Since 2006, sustainable consumption and production had been one of six core priorities within the programme of work, which defined the focus of UNEP activities. UNEP worked with diverse actors, including public authorities, international agencies, industry associations and civil society to mainstream and support the development and implementation of sustainable consumption and production approaches, practices and policies. In consultation with key partners, UNEP had proposed 11 programmes for possible inclusion in the framework, based on the priorities identified through the Marrakech Process and on existing initiatives and partnerships, including the work of the Marrakech Process task forces.

90. The programme of cleaner production centres launched by UNIDO and UNEP in 1994 now included 48 centres around the world. These had produced technical tools and training materials to train thousands of national cleaner production experts. Regional round tables and networks of national cleaner production centres have been established in Africa, Asia and Latin America. As a result of the programme's evaluation in 2008 and 2009, a refocused programme on resource efficient and cleaner production was launched. Although the resource efficient and cleaner production concept had identified win-win opportunities, large-scale implementation across industries and countries had not occurred. The new programme sought to expand and strengthen the network of national cleaner production centres and other resource efficient and cleaner production service providers, capture those win-win opportunities and mainstream resource efficient and cleaner production into Government policy and enterprise finance.

91. Participants acknowledged that the work of the United Nations agencies and programmes, including those not present at the meeting, such as the United Nations Institute for Training and Research, was encouraging, but suggested that more was needed to scale up and mainstream sustainable consumption and production.

Way forward

92. The Chair of the nineteenth session of the Commission stressed the need to work towards achieving a framework that represented a highest common denominator. There was emerging convergence on the functions of a framework, a coordinated institutional structure and the criteria for developing programmes.

93. In preparing for the Intergovernmental Preparatory Meeting, the Chair indicated the need for a further background document, jointly prepared by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs and UNEP, to elaborate further on those elements where there was a sense of convergence. The document was intended to further facilitate discussions during the Preparatory Meeting.

94. Although the annex to the second background paper on programmes and initiatives was considered useful, it was suggested that the Secretariat consult further with Member States and other stakeholders on potential programmes for the framework, prior to the Preparatory Meeting, and reflect the results as appropriate in a revised annex to be made available as a background paper for the Preparatory Meeting.

95. Many ministries and officials in Member States were still not very familiar with sustainable consumption and production and a few participants indicated that delegates should raise awareness in their own countries about the concept. The Chair's summary could be used as the basis for regional consultations with a view to building a regional consensus on key elements for the framework ahead of the Preparatory Meeting.

96. The Chair pointed to the need to brief delegations based in New York, two to three weeks prior to the Preparatory Meeting, on the outcome of the intersessional meeting.